

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-12 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 13-23 are added through this reply. Therefore, claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 and 14 are independent.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants appreciate that the Examiner has indicated claims 7, 8 and 10 to be allowable and that claim 4 includes allowable subject matter.

§ 102 REJECTION – OKISU

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Okisu et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0033701). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. *See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02.* Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Okisu fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, independent claim 1 recites, in part “a second memory for storing the plurality of second image signals produced.” Contrary to the

Examiner's allegation, Okisu cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest at least this feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Figures 8 and 9 discloses the features of claim 1. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that the image memory 193 of Figure 9 is equivalent to the first memory as claimed, the shading corrector 194, the image data interpolator 195, and the image synthesizer 196 as being equivalent to the plurality of image processors as claimed, and that HD Card 10 as equivalent to the second memory as claimed. *See Okisu, Figures 8 and 9.*

However, it is noted that the HD Card 10 only receives the output of the final stage device, which in Figure 9 is the output of the image synthesizer 196. Okisu is entirely silent regarding whether the output of the shading corrector 194 or the image data interpolator 195 can each be stored in the HD Card 10. Indeed, Okisu strongly teaches away from this feature. Therefore, it is clear that independent claim 1 is distinguishable over Okisu.

Independent claim 9 recites, in part "storing each of the produced plurality of second image signals in a memory." It has been demonstrated above that Okisu cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest at least this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claim 9 is also distinguishable over Okisu.

Claims 2 and 6 depend from independent claim 1 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 2 and 6 are also distinguishable over Okisu.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6 and 9 based on Okisu be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – OKISU, TANIZOE

Claims 3, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Okisu in view of Tanizoe et al. (U.S. Patent 6,753,917). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 3, 11 and 12 depend from independent claims 1 or 9 directly or indirectly. It has been demonstrated above that independent claims 1 and 9 are both distinguishable over Okisu. Tanizoe has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Okisu. Therefore, claims 1 and 9 are also distinguishable over the combination of Okisu and Tanizoe. For at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 3, 11 and 12 are also distinguishable over the combination of Okisu and Tanizoe.

It should be noted that the dependent claims are also distinguishable on their own merit. For example, claim 3 recites “each of said plurality of image processors processing, according to the parameters, the plurality of second image signals to be displayed on one of the plurality of display units which

corresponds to said image processor. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, combining Tanizoe with Okisu will not result in teaching or suggesting this feature as alleged by the Examiner.

More specifically, Tanizoe is directed toward a device for interchanging displays in a digital camera whereby the method of display changes between displaying the image on a built in liquid crystal device and displaying the image on a monitor device by linking the camera to the monitor device through a video cable. *See Tanizoe, column 1, lines 8-16.* The Examiner relies upon Figure 1 and the related description of Tanizoe to allegedly teach specializing for particular displays.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the output of the CCD is directed to one of the first processing circuit 10, the second processing circuit 12, or the progressive processing circuit 8. It is noted that only the first and second processing circuits are directly related to processing the image sensed by the CCD 4 to be displayed either to the camera display device 26 or to the monitor device 28.

However, Kanizoe is very clear that the first processing circuit or the second processing circuit are only invoked when the shutter button is not being depressed, i.e. no picture is being taken. *See Tanizoe, Column 4, lines 12-13.* In either the main body display mode or the monitor display mode (corresponding to displaying to the liquid crystal display and to the external monitor, respectively), the digital to analog switch 22 directs the image data

away from the memory 24 and toward the display devices 26 and 28. In other words, Tanizoe only contemplates adjusting the image purely for display purposes only.

If the shutter button is depressed, i.e. the picture is being taken and stored, specializing for displays does not occur at all. *See Tanizoe, column 4, lines 43-67.*

Thus, if the teachings of Tanizoe is applied to the device as disclosed in Okisu, one of ordinary skill would realize that the outputs of the first and second processing circuits of Tanizoe would be directed only to the display and not to the HD Card 10 to be stored. Thus, it is clear that claim 3 is distinguishable on its own merit.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 11-12 based on Okisu and Tanizoe be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – OKISU, KONISHI

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Okisu in view of Konishi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,420,635). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim, and it has shown above that claim 1 is distinguishable over Okisu. Konishi has not been, and indeed cannot

be, relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Okisu. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Okisu and Konishi.

For at least due to the dependency thereon, claim 5 is also distinguishable over the combination of Okisu and Konishi. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 based on Okisu and Konishi be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS

Through this reply, claims 13-23 are added. All new claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in any combination. For example, independent claim 14 recites, in part, "storing each of the plurality of second image data into a memory." It has been clearly demonstrated above that none of the cited references can be relied upon to teach or suggest at least this feature.

Claims 13 and 15-23 depend from independent claim or 14 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least due to the reasons stated with respect to the independent claims, these new dependent claims are also distinguishable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully request that the new claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION


All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of one (1) month to October 30, 2005 in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$120.00 is enclosed herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: 
Michael R. Cammarata
Reg. No. 39,491

HNS
MRC/HNS/cr/bsh

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000